



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/759,108	12/02/96	QIN	J 12.975

JOHN R SCHENIAN  
KIMBERLY CLARK CORPORATION  
401 NORTH LAKE STREET  
NEENAH WI 54956

IM11/0827

EXAMINER

REDDICK, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1713	9

DATE MAILED: 08/27/98

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/759,108**

Applicant(s)  
**QIN ET AL**

Examiner  
**Judy M. Reddick**

Group Art Unit  
**1713**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Judy M. Reddick

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. John Schenian

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 25, 1998

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed:

Chmelir(U.S.5,264,471); Mima et al(U.S.3,962,158);

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant argued that the compositions of the prior art supra were indicative of an admixture of a neutralized polymer + basic material in an aqueous solution vs the presently claimed invention which was directed to a dry admixture of an acidic water-soluble, water-insoluble polymer and a basic material wherein neutralization occurred insitu, i.e., once the dry admixture came in contact with the insult generated from urine, etc. The Examiner advised applicant that the claims were simply not limited to that which applicant argued as the difference. Applicant proposed to limit the claims so as to reflect the difference over the prior art of record. Applicant pointed out that the claimed invention engendered a very slow rate of absorbency compared to that of the prior art of record. The Examiner advised applicant that the invention seemed to lie in the process vs the composition. A determination of patentability will be made when applicants' arguments + amendments as proposed have become an official part of the record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

**JUDY M. REDDICK**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 150-1402**

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.